



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/810,113	03/25/2004	Peter Arthur Schade	2797P	8045
29141	7590	06/27/2006	EXAMINER	
SAWYER LAW GROUP LLP			SORRELL, ERON J	
P O BOX 51418			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
PALO ALTO, CA 94303			2182	

DATE MAILED: 06/27/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/810,113

Applicant(s)

SCHADE, PETER ARTHUR

Examiner

Eron J. Sorrell

Art Unit

2182

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 4/13/06.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 25 March 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

DETAILED ACTION

*Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1,3-5,12, and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Vaillancourt (U.S. Patent No. 5,557,778).

3. Referring to apparatus claims 1 and 12, Vaillancourt teaches a device comprising:

a processor (see item 510 in figure 7); and

a single I/O interface to a first computer of a first star network coupled to the processor (see item 430 in figure 4 and figure 5B), comprising a host port of the first host computer (see item 432 in figure 4); and a peripheral port to a second host computer of a second star network (see item 443 in figure 4) wherein the host port and the peripheral port are defined using predetermined signals and wherein the peripheral port and

Art Unit: 2182

the host port are both active at the same time (see lines 39-43 of column 4 and paragraph bridging columns 4 and 5).

4. Referring to claim 3, Vaillancourt teaches the two connected devices utilizing the single I/O interface can have a peer-to-peer connection via the host port and the peripheral port (see lines 39-57 of column 4, "dual-hub configuration").

5. Referring to claim 4, Vaillancourt teaches two connected devices using a single I/O interface can have a one-to-many relationship via either the host port and/or the peripheral port (see lines 39-57 of column 4, "single-hub configuration").

6. Referring to claims 5 and 13, Vaillancourt teaches a device needs only one physical I/O port via the connector that includes a host port and a peripheral port which are defined using the predetermined signals (see figure 4, note there is one port per device).

*Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2182

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vaillancourt in view of Brief et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,122,676 hereinafter "Brief").

9. Referring to claim 2, Vaillancourt teaches the star networks, however Vaillancourt fails to teach the ports are USB ports and the star networks are USB networks.

Brief teaches, in an analogous system, a USB network implemented as a star network wherein the ports are USB ports.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to modify the system and method of Vaillancourt with the above teachings of Brief. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make such modification in order to take advantage of the high data transfer rates between hosts and peripherals that the USB standard provides.

Art Unit: 2182

10. Claims 6-11, and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vaillancourt in view of Hanson et al.

(U.S. Patent No. 6,460,094 hereinafter "Hanson").

11. Referring to claims 6 and 14, Vaillancourt fails to teach the predetermined signals comprise host differential data lines and peripheral differential data lines.

Hanson teaches, in an analogous system, the above limitations (see lines 52-65 of column 4).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to modify the apparatus and system of Vaillancourt with the above teachings of Hanson. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make such modification quickly determine whether connected device is a high speed device as suggested by Hanson (see lines 3-16 of column 2).

12. Referring to claim 7, Vaillancourt teaches a network comprising:

a first device (Host A); the first device including a single I/O interface to a host computer of a first star network (see item 430 in figure 4), the interface including a host port of the first computer (see item 432 in figure 4) and a

Art Unit: 2182

peripheral port to a second host computer of a second star network (see item 443 in figure 4), wherein the host port and the peripheral port are defined using predetermined signals (see lines 39-43 of column 4 and paragraph bridging columns 4 and 5); and

a second device for communicating with the first device (see any of items 434-439), the second device using the predetermined signals, wherein the peripheral port and the host port are both active at the same time (see lines 39-43 of column 4 and paragraph bridging columns 4 and 5).

Vaillancourt fails to teach the network being a USB network.

Hanson teaches a system wherein a USB bus is used to connect a wide variety of peripherals and allows for high transmission rates (see lines 24-37 of column 1).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to modify the system of Vaillancourt with the above teachings of Hanson to benefit the high transmission rate USB provides.

13. Referring to claims 8 and 9, Hanson teaches the host a peripheral ports are USB ports and the predetermined signals are

Art Unit: 2182

within the USB standard (see lines 47 of column 4 to line 2 of column 5).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to modify the system of Vaillancourt with the above teachings of Hanson for the same reasons as mentioned above.

14. Referring to claim 10, Vaillancourt teaches the first and second devices can be any of a camera, computer, PDA, laptop device, handheld device, printer, and cellular phone (see lines 10-16 of column 1).

15. Referring to claim 11, Vaillancourt fails to teach the predetermined signals comprise host differential data lines and peripheral differential data lines.

Hanson teaches, in an analogous system, the above limitations (see lines 52-65 of column 4).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to modify the apparatus and system of Vaillancourt with the above teachings of Hanson. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make such modification quickly determine whether

Art Unit: 2182

connected device is a high speed device as suggested by Hanson (see lines 3-16 of column 2).

*Response to Arguments*

16. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1,7, and 12 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

*Conclusion*

17. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

Art Unit: 2182

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Eron J. Sorrell whose telephone number is 571 272-4160. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:00AM - 4:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kim Huynh can be reached on 571-272-4147. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

  
KIM HUYNH  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

6/22/06